

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

213

CRM-M-2384-2023

Date of decision: 24.04.2023

Karamjit Singh @ Mintu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. N.S. Gill, Advocate for
Ms. Manpreet Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in case FIR No.298 dated 13.10.2019 under Sections 22 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, 'the NDPS Act') (Section 25 of the NDPS Act and Section 207 of the M.V. Act added lateron) registered at Police Station Bhawanigarh, District Sangrur.

2. In compliance of order dated 23.03.2023, Mr. Surinder Lamba, Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur, along with SHO Jaspreet Singh, is present in Court today.

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has informed the Court that inadvertently on the last date of hearing this Court had been informed that none of the official witnesses had appeared before the Trial Court to get their evidence recorded. Learned State counsel

submits that in fact as many as 07 prosecution witnesses out of the 16 had got their evidence recorded on the last date of hearing i.e. 23.03.2023.

4. This Court has been apprised today on instructions by the learned State counsel that the prosecution evidence stands concluded and the next date fixed for 25.04.2023 and hence, in the circumstances the trial shall not take much time to conclude.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court is not inclined to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner in view of huge recovery of 5000 tablets of Clovidol SR 100 containing salt Tramadol Hydrochloride, effected from him and that too pursuant to a secret information wherein the petitioner had been specifically named.

7. Dismissed.

8. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

24.04.2023

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No